

1 STEPHEN F. HENRY, Esq.

2 STATE BAR # 142336
3 2625 Alcatraz Avenue, # 615
4 Berkeley, California 94705
5 Telephone: (510) 898-1883
6 Facsimile (510) 295-2516
7 shenry@SHenrylaw.com8 MARK L. MOSLEY (State Bar # 134349)
9 MOSCONE EMBLIDGE & QUADRA, LLP
10 220 Montgomery Street. Suite 2100
11 San Francisco, CA 94104
12 Telephone: (415) 592-4342
13 Facsimile: (415) 362-2006
14 mmosley@meqlaw.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 MYRICK TANTIADO, an individual,

19 Case No. C 07-02874 CRB MED

20 Plaintiff,

21 DECLARATION OF STEPHEN F.
22 HENRY IN SUPPORT OF
23 PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
24 MOTION FOR SUMMARY
25 ADJUDICATION26 POWER MEDICAL INTERVENTIONS, a
27 Pennsylvania corporation, and DOES ONE
28 through FIFTY, inclusive,

29 Defendants.

30 Original filing date: April 6, 2007
31 Removal date: June 1, 2007

32 I, Stephen Henry, declare:

33 1. I am attorney for plaintiff in the above entitled matter. I have personal knowledge
34 of the facts in this Declaration and if called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently
35 to the facts herein.36 2. Attached to this Declaration as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of Defendant
37 Power Medical Intervention's Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Set Of Interrogatories
38 received from Defendant.

3. Attached to this Declaration as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of excerpts of the Deposition of Myrick Tantiado.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Berkeley, California on August 15, 2008

STEPHEN F. HENRY

EXHIBIT A

1 William I. Edlund, State Bar No. 25013
 2 Alyson L. Huber, State Bar No. 202713
 3 BARTKO, ZANKEL, TARRANT & MILLER
 4 A Professional Corporation
 5 900 Front Street, Suite 300
 6 San Francisco, California 94111
 7 Telephone: (415) 956-1900
 8 Facsimile: (415) 956-1152
 9 wedlund@bztm.com
 10 ahuber@bztm.com

11 Michael L. Rosen, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

12 John E. Duke, *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

13 FOLEY HOAG LLP

14 155 Seaport Boulevard

15 Boston, MA 02210

16 Telephone: (617) 832-1000

17 Facsimile: (617) 832-7000

18 mrosen@foleyhoag.com

19 jduke@foleyhoag.com

20 Attorneys for Defendant Power Medical Interventions

21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

29 MYRICK TANTIADO, an individual,

30 Case No. C 07-02874 EDL

31 Plaintiff,

32 vs.

33 POWER MEDICAL INTERVENTIONS, a
 34 Pennsylvania corporation, and DOES ONE
 35 through FIFTY, inclusive,

36 Defendants.

37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
**DEFENDANT POWER MEDICAL
 44 INTERVENTION'S SUPPLEMENTAL
 45 ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
 46 SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. These answers are made solely for the purposes of this action. Each answer is subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, propriety and admissibility, as well as to any and all other objections on any grounds that would require the exclusion of any answer or any portion thereof if any of said answer were offered in evidence, all of which objections and grounds are hereby expressly reserved and may be interposed at the time of any deposition or at or before any hearing or trial in this matter.

2. The following answers are based on information presently available to and located by PMI and its attorneys and, except for explicit facts expressly set forth herein, no incidental or implied admissions are intended hereby. The fact that PMI answers or objects to any Interrogatory or part thereof is not intended and shall not be construed as an admission that PMI accepts or admits the existence of any facts set forth in or assumed by such Interrogatory, or that such response or objection constitutes admissible evidence. The fact that PMI answers all, or part, of any Interrogatory is not intended and shall not be construed as a waiver by PMI of all, or any part, of any objection to any Interrogatory made herein.

3. PMI has not completed its investigation of this action, has not completed its discovery or trial preparation, and may discover additional facts and/or documents responsive to the Interrogatories in the future. These answers hereinafter are based on PMI's knowledge, information and belief at this time, and are made without prejudice to the following objections, and are based on PMI's diligent search of those records that it has located and that it reasonably believes would contain the information sought. Nevertheless, some of the information sought by Plaintiff's Interrogatories are not routinely compiled by PMI, and are not readily accessible to any agent or employee of PMI. Furthermore, these answers were prepared based on PMI's good faith interpretations and understanding of the Interrogatories and are subject to correction for

1 inadvertent errors or omissions, if any. PMI reserves the right to refer to, to conduct discovery
2 with reference to or to offer into evidence at the time of trial, any and all facts, evidence,
3 documents and things developed during the course of discovery and trial preparation,
4 notwithstanding the reference to facts, evidence, documents and things in these answers. PMI
5 assumes no obligation to voluntarily supplement or amend these answers to reflect information,
6 evidence, documents or things discovered following service of these answers. Nevertheless,
7 PMI specifically reserves the right to amend and/or supplement these answers at any time.
8

9 4. To the extent the Interrogatories purport to seek information which is protected by
10 the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work-product privilege or doctrine, PMI will not
11 provide any such information and will assume that the Interrogatories apply only to that
12 information falling outside the scope of the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work-
13 product privilege or doctrine. Inadvertent disclosure of any such privileged information shall not
14 constitute a waiver of any privilege or ground for objecting to disclosing such information and
15 shall not waive PMI's right to object to the use of such information.
16

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

17 1. PMI objects to each and every Interrogatory to the extent that it purports to
18 impose upon PMI obligations in excess of those set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

19 2. PMI objects to each and every Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information
20 subject to the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other privilege or
21 protection, or information otherwise not discoverable within the meaning of the Federal Rules of
22 Civil Procedure.

23 3. PMI objects to each and every Interrogatory to the extent that the discovery
24 sought by any such Interrogatory is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is obtainable
25 from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, and to the
26

1 extent compliance with any such request would be unduly burdensome, expensive, annoying and
2 oppressive, as prohibited by Rule 26(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

3 4. PMI objects to each and every Interrogatory that is not time limited as overly
4 broad.

5 7. PMI objects to each and every Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks confidential
6 or proprietary information, including business information and/or business trade secrets, whether
7 concerning itself or a third party, or concerning confidential personal information about
8 individuals, including PMI's employees.

10 **SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES**

11 PMI's specific objections and responses are subject to and without waiver of the
12 foregoing general objections. PMI reserves the right to revise, supplement, or clarify any of the
13 answers set forth below.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

16 For each denial, contained in your Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint, of factual allegations
17 asserted in Plaintiff's Complaint, please state the factual basis for that denial.

18 **ANSWER:**

19 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it seeks information subject to the attorney-
20 client privilege and the work product doctrine. PMI also objects to this interrogatory because it
21 seeks legal conclusions. PMI further objects to this interrogatory insofar as it seeks confidential
22 information. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI
23 refers Plaintiff to its answers to the remaining interrogatories, the documents PMI will produce
24 in response to Plaintiff's Document Requests, and PMI's disclosures.

25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

26 For each Affirmative Defense contained in your Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint, state
27 the factual and legal bases for that Affirmative Defense.

1 **ANSWER:**

2 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it seeks information subject to the attorney-
 3 client privilege and the work product doctrine. PMI also objects to this interrogatory because it
 4 seeks legal conclusions. PMI further objects to this interrogatory insofar as it seeks confidential
 5 information. Subject to and without waving the above general and specific objections, PMI
 6 states:

- 7 ▪ First Defense: Myrick Tantiado was an at-will employee who could be
 8 terminated for any reason or no reason at all. Nevertheless, Myrick Tantiado's
 9 employment with PMI was terminated for poor performance. Moreover, PMI
 10 paid Myrick Tantiado everything he was owed under the applicable commission
 11 policy, PMI's expense reimbursement policy, and PMI's vacation policy.
- 12 ▪ Second Defense: On information and belief, Myrick Tantiado was either
 13 nonresponsive or an obstacle to the return of the products for which the sales
 14 commission offset is the basis of his claim for unreimbursed expenses.
- 15 ▪ Third Defense: Myrick Tantiado was an at-will employee who could be
 16 terminated for any reason or no reason at all.
- 17 ▪ Fifth Defense: Myrick Tantiado did not fulfill the expectations of his position
 18 while an employee of PMI.

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

20 Identify all reasons for the termination of Myrick Tantiado by Defendant.

21 **ANSWER:**

22 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 23 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 24 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that Myrick Tantiado's
 25 employment with PMI terminated because of his poor job performance.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Identify each person who participated in making the decision to terminate Myrick Tantiado from employment by Defendant.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that John Roache, PMI's Vice President of Sales at the time and who is no longer employed by PMI, made the decision to terminate Myrick Tantiado's employment with PMI.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Identify each document relied upon, considered or referred to in making the decision to terminate Myrick Tantiado.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PMI further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information subject to the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-privileged documents in response to Document Request No. 4 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

Identify each complaint received at any time by Defendant from any person or entity regarding the performance of the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-

1 privileged documents containing, describing, or communicating a complaint received by PMI
 2 regarding the performance of the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System created or
 3 received by PMI since January 1, 2004 upon entry by the Court of an appropriate Confidentiality
 4 Agreement and Protective Order in response to Document Request No. 5 from which
 5 information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

7 Identify and describe each complaint received at any time by Defendant from any person
 8 or entity regarding the performance of the Circular Stapling Unit, 25mm (CS25).

9 **ANSWER:**

10 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 11 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 12 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 13 privileged documents containing, describing, or communicating a complaint received by PMI
 14 regarding the performance of the Circular Stapling Unit 25mm (CS25) created or received by
 15 PMI since January 1, 2004 in response to Document Request No. 6 from which information
 16 responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained upon entry by the Court of an appropriate
 17 Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order.

18 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

19 Identify and describe each complaint received at any time by Defendant from any person
 20 or entity regarding the performance of the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29).

21 **ANSWER:**

22 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 23 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 24 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 25 privileged documents containing, describing, or communicating a complaint received by PMI
 26 regarding the performance of the Circular Stapling Unit 29mm (CS29) created or received by
 27 PMI since January 1, 2004 in response to Document Request No. 7 from which information

1 responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained upon entry by the Court of an appropriate
 2 Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order.

3 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

4 Identify and describe each action of any kind and at any time taken by the United States
 5 Food and Drug Administration regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System, the
 6 Circular Stapling Unit, 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29).

7 **ANSWER:**

8 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 9 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 10 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 11 privileged documents created or received by PMI since January 1, 2004 in response to Document
 12 Request No. 8 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

14 Identify and describe each communication of any kind and at any time from the United
 15 States Food and Drug Administration regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling
 16 System, the Circular Stapling Unit, 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm
 17 (CS29).

18 **ANSWER:**

19 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 20 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 21 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 22 privileged documents created or received by PMI since January 1, 2004 in response to Document
 23 Request No. 9 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

24 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

25 Identify and describe each communication of any kind and at any time to the United
 26 States Food and Drug Administration regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling
 27

1 System, the Circular Stapling Unit, 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm
 2 (CS29).

3 **ANSWER:**

4 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 5 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 6 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 7 privileged documents created or received by PMI since January 1, 2004 in response to Document
 8 Request No. 10 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

10 Identify and describe each communication of any kind and at any time from any medical
 11 doctor regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System, the Circular Stapling Unit,
 12 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29).

13 **ANSWER:**

14 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 15 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 16 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-
 17 privileged documents containing, describing, or communicating a complaint from any medical
 18 doctor regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System, the Circular Stapling Unit,
 19 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29) created or received by PMI since
 20 January 1, 2004, if any, upon entry by the Court of an appropriate Confidentiality Agreement and
 21 Protective Order in response to Document Request No. 11 from which information responsive to
 22 this interrogatory may be obtained.

23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

24 Identify and describe each communication of any kind and at any time by Myrick
 25 Tantiado regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System, the Circular Stapling
 26 Unit, 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29).

27

28

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce non-privileged documents containing, describing or communicating a complaint by Myrick Tantiado regarding the SurgAssist Computer Powered Stapling System, the Circular Stapling Unit, 25mm (CS25) and/or the Circular Stapling Unit, 29mm (CS29), if any, upon entry by the Court of an appropriate Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order in response to Document Request No. 12 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

Please state how many vacation days Myrick Tantiado accrued each year while working for Defendant.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that under the terms of PMI's vacation policy Myrick Tantiado accrued 10 vacation days per year at a rate of 0.833 days per month.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

Please state how many vacation days Myrick Tantiado used each year while working for Defendant.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that Myrick Tantiado did not use any vacation days in 2006.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

2 Please state how many accrued and unused vacation days Myrick Tantiado had at the
3 time of his termination by Defendant.

4 **ANSWER:**

5 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
6 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
7 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that under the terms of
8 PMI's vacation policy Myrick Tantiado had 5 days of accrued and unused vacation days at the
9 time his employment with PMI terminated.

10 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

11 Please state whether Myrick Tantiado was paid for all of his accrued and unused vacation
12 days at the time of his termination by Defendant.

13 **ANSWER:**

14 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
15 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
16 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that Myrick Tantiado was
17 not paid for all accrued and unused vacation days at the time his employment with PMI
18 terminated.

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

20 Please state the amount of reimbursable expenses were claimed by Myrick Tantiado at
21 the time of his termination by Defendant.

22 **ANSWER:**

23 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
24 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
25 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it does not know the
26 amount of reimbursable expenses Myrick Tantiado claimed at the time his employment with
27

1 PMI terminated. However, in an email from Myrick Tantiado to Rita Esposito dated August 7,
 2 2006, Myrick Tantiado claimed \$4,464.03 in reimbursable expenses.

3 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

4 Please state the amount of reimbursable expenses accrued by Myrick Tantiado remained
 5 unreimbursed by Defendant at the time of his termination by Defendant.

6 **ANSWER:**

7 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 8 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 9 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that no reimbursable
 10 expenses accrued by Myrick Tantiado remained unreimbursed by PMI at the time his
 11 employment with PMI terminated.

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

13 Please state all reasons why Defendant did not reimburse all reimbursable expenses
 14 accrued by Myrick Tantiado at the time of his termination by Defendant.

15 **ANSWER:**

16 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 17 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 18 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that no reimbursable
 19 expenses accrued by Myrick Tantiado remained unreimbursed by PMI at the time his
 20 employment with PMI terminated.

21 **INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

22 Please describe Defendant's commission policy.

23 **ANSWER:**

24 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
 25 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
 26 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce
 27
 28

1 documents in response to Document Request No. 20 from which information responsive to this
2 interrogatory may be obtained.

3 **INTERROGATORY NO. 22:**

4 Please describe Defendant's policy regarding offsetting commissions upon return of a
5 product.

6 **ANSWER:**

7 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
8 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
9 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that any sales
10 commissions paid to its sales representatives are subject to offset if those same products are
11 subsequently returned by customers.

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 23:**

13 Please identify how Plaintiff was informed of Defendant's commission policy.

14 **ANSWER:**

15 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
16 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
17 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that Plaintiff was informed
18 of PMI's commission policy in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated July 1, 2004
19 offer letter; in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated December 29, 2004; in PMI's
20 2006 Sales Compensation Plan, a copy of which was distributed to Myrick Tantiado; in a letter
21 from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated March 24, 2006; and in a letter from Rita Esposito
22 to Myrick Tantiado dated March 29, 2006.

23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 24:**

24 Please identify how Plaintiff was informed of Defendant's policy regarding offsetting
25 commissions upon return of a product.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiver the above general and specific objections, PMI states that Myrick Tantiado was informed of its policy regarding offsetting commissions upon return of a product in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated July 1, 2004 offer letter; in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated December 29, 2004; in PMI's 2006 Sales Compensation Plan, a copy of which was distributed to Myrick Tantiado; in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated March 24, 2006; in a letter from Rita Esposito to Myrick Tantiado dated March 29, 2006; and orally by his manager as well as in training after hire.

INTERROGATORY NO. 25:

Please identify what product was returned to Defendant which created the basis for offsetting Plaintiff's commission at the time of his termination by Defendant.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that it will produce documents in response to Document Request No. 24 from which information responsive to this interrogatory may be obtained.

INTERROGATORY NO. 26:

Please identify who returned the product to Defendant which created the basis for offsetting Plaintiff's commission at the time of his termination by Defendant.

ANSWER:

PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that the University of California San Francisco returned the products.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 27:**

2 Please identify the reason stated for the return by the person or entity who returned the
3 product to Defendant which created the basis for offsetting Plaintiff's commission at the time of
4 his termination by Defendant.

5 **ANSWER:**

6 PMI objects to this interrogatory because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome,
7 and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and
8 without waiving the above general and specific objections, PMI states that the University of
9 California San Francisco did not give a reason for returning the products the commission for
10 which was offset against Myrick Tantiado's final expense reimbursement. Further answering,
11 PMI states that the University of California San Francisco did not need to give a reason since it
12 first attempted to return the products in February 2006 during the evaluation period for these
13 products.

14
15 DATED: October 26, 2007

BARTKO, ZANKEL, TARRANT & MILLER
A Professional Corporation

16
17 FOLEY HOAG LLP

18
19 By: 

John E. Duke

20 Attorneys for Defendant
POWER MEDICAL INTERVENTIONS, INC.

VERIFICATION

I, Rita Esposito, declare as follows:

I presently am Director, Human Resources of Power Medical Interventions, Inc. I have read Defendant Power Medical Interventions Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories ("Responses") and, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the Responses are accurate.

I verify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 26, 2007, in Langhorne, Pennsylvania.

Rita Esposito
Rita Esposito

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

--oo--

MYRICK TANTIADO, an individual,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
 vs.) Case No. C07-02874
) CRB MED
POWER MEDICAL INTERVENTIONS, a)
Pennsylvania corporation, and)
DOES ONE through FIFTY,)
inclusive,)
)
 Defendants.)
)

CERTIFIED COPY

DEPOSITION OF
MYRICK TANTIADO

April 10, 2008

REPORTED BY: CAROLYN M. MANN, CSR 10066 [#408119]

M E R R I L L L E G A L S O L U T I O N S

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, CAROLYN M. MANN, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the
4 foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the
5 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the
6 within-entitled cause;

7 That said deposition was taken down in
8 shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and
9 place therein stated, and that the testimony of the said
10 witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting, by
11 computer, under my direction and supervision;

12 That before completion of the deposition,
13 review of the transcript ~~[X]~~ was [] was not requested.
14 If requested, any changes made by the deponent (and
15 provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are
16 appended hereto.

17 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
18 attorney for either or any of the parties to the said
19 deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of
20 this cause, and that I am not related to any of the
21 parties thereto.

22 DATED: April 21, 2008.

23 CM

24
25 CAROLYN M. MANN, CSR No. 10066

1 THE WITNESS: I believe that Mr. Chase and I
2 spoke a lot about the issues that we were faced since he
3 was my direct supervisor through most of my employment
4 at PMI. So we have had extensive discussions regarding
5 the issues throughout my employment.

6 MR. DUKE: Q. When you were regional manager
7 did any of the, any of your sales force relay any
8 concerns about PMI's product lines to you?

9 A. Yes, I believe so. To the best of my
10 knowledge, I believe there were, there were discussions.

11 Q. Tell me the substance of those discussions.

12 A. I believe that Victoria Oldridge, who was the
13 East Bay sales rep, had expressed concern selling
14 certain stapler, certain stapling product lines, and we
15 talked about how we could strategize to help her with
16 her concerns and her issues.

17 Q. And so you gave her advice as to how to help
18 her through her concerns and issues; is that correct?

19 A. To the best of my knowledge, I believe so.

20 Q. Do you remember what advice you gave her?

21 A. I believe when I was regional manager I was
22 given advice to myself from other regional managers that
23 I felt needed to be conveyed to my sales force.

24 Q. What was that advice?

25 A. To the best of my knowledge, there were

1 discussions that certain lot numbers that were shipped
2 to hospitals were actually defective, yet -- and
3 although the company knew that these lot numbers were
4 defective, they were sent out anyhow. So we needed to
5 manage, or ensure that the surgeons were not using those
6 lot numbers.

7 Q. Who told you that there were certain lot
8 numbers that were defective?

9 A. To the best of my knowledge, I believe that
10 was shared with, through practically the entire sales
11 force. And Scott Connolly, who was the New York sales
12 rep, had formulated or determined that based on his
13 experience, that the, this was the best protocol to
14 manage defective stapling products so that the surgeons
15 would not get their hands on them.

16 Q. And you testified just a minute ago that the
17 company knew that there were defective lot numbers.
18 What's the basis for your knowledge?

19 A. The basis of my knowledge is because I believe
20 Keith Mintun, who was, who had many different roles
21 within PMI, but he knew exactly what was defective and
22 what was not, and he was Mike Whitman's right-hand man.
23 And furthermore, one of the other regional managers who
24 was based in New York, I believe his name was Ed
25 Wierczbicki, who was the manager for Scott Connolly,

1 expressed deep concern for the product line, and offered
2 a way to help fix the issue. I believe he was
3 terminated when Mike Whitman did not want to, or was not
4 willing to take his advice.

5 Q. Do you know that?

6 A. Based on what was told to me.

7 Q. Were you present at -- I'm sorry. There was
8 the name of the guy who was above Connolly that you just
9 mentioned.

10 A. Ed Wierczbicki. That was told to me.

11 Q. So you weren't present at any of these
12 conversations that you've just discussed.

13 A. No.

14 Q. You just heard about them through the
15 grapevine?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Well, let me back up a little bit.

18 A. Heard about what through the grapevine? Can
19 you just, can you . . .

20 Q. Everything you just talked about as far as how
21 the company knew that there were defective lot numbers.

22 A. No, Keith Mintun knew that there were
23 defective lot numbers. I knew because I spoke with him
24 about the defective lot numbers. I did not know
25 firsthand whether Ed Wierczbicki was fired because he,

1 because he expressed concern with the, with the surgical
2 stapling lines; that was hearsay. But Keith Mintun had
3 spoken with me at some point maybe on several occasions
4 with regards to the lot numbers, to the best of my
5 recollection.

6 Q. So you had several conversations with Keith
7 Mintun about lot numbers, defective lot numbers, in
8 which you told Keith Mintun that there were defective
9 lot numbers; is that correct?

10 A. No. To the best of my knowledge, the
11 conversations were more so to ensure that our customers
12 or our surgeons were using the proper lot numbers, not
13 the defective ones. So I think it was triple zero 300,
14 the lot numbers that were triple zero 300 and greater
15 were actually the lot numbers that were fine. So if we
16 had any lot numbers that were triple, that were below
17 triple 0300, then we would make sure that the surgeons
18 did not use those products. So that, there were several
19 conversations to that effect. I don't know the exact
20 conversation, but that was the gist of the conversations
21 that had, that had occurred.

22 Q. Was anything else said in these conversations
23 with Keith Mintun?

24 A. I don't recall other specific things that had,
25 that we had talked about. I believe that Keith at one

1 point had flown up to co-travel with me because he
2 wanted to help win back the California Pacific Medical
3 Center and work with Dr. Lawrence Yee again, and I do
4 remember him stating that or concurring that there are
5 issues or there were issues and that we just have to
6 make sure that he doesn't use the lot numbers that were
7 defective.

8 Q. Do you remember when the first of these
9 conversations with Keith Mintun occurred?

10 A. I don't remember the timeline. I just
11 remember these conversations.

12 Q. Was there a conversation in 2004?

13 A. I don't recall when the conversations took
14 place. I just remember that we had conversations
15 throughout my employment at Power Medical Interventions.

16 Q. When you say throughout your employment, do
17 you mean really truly throughout your employment, or was
18 it more towards the end of your employment, towards the
19 middle?

20 A. I believe it was more -- it, it may have
21 started in the middle of my employment and then
22 progressed toward the late, or toward the tail end of my
23 employment. There's no conversations had occurred when
24 I was recently, when I was hired.

25 Q. In 2005 were there conversations with

1 Mr. Mintun?

2 A. I don't recall what year, whether it was, in
3 fact, 2005, but we did have conversations.

4 Q. Did you ever relay any concerns about any of
5 PMI's product lines to Michael Whitman?

6 A. Never. I --

7 Q. Who was Pat Holmes?

8 MR. MOSLEY: Well, he was in the middle of --
9 you have to let the witness answer the question.

10 MR. DUKE: I did. He answered the question.

11 MR. MOSLEY: He said "and," and then you
12 started your new question.

13 MR. DUKE: Because he answered the question.

14 MR. MOSLEY: You can answer the question.

15 MR. DUKE: No, no.

16 MR. MOSLEY: You can answer the question.

17 MR. DUKE: Excuse me. This is my deposition.

18 MR. MOSLEY: You can't cut him off. I'm not
19 going to let you cut him off or we're ending the
20 deposition now. You've cut him off in mid sentence, and
21 if you do that again, the deposition is over.

22 You get to answer that question.

23 MR. DUKE: No.

24 MR. MOSLEY: If you have more to say, you get
25 to answer it.